2Draft Agenda for Standardized Water Quality Assessment Methodology Discussion

Day 2 (June 4): morning session

Purpose: Define a standardized methodology to evaluate water quality data for the purposes of CWA 303(d) listing/delisting, water quality-based NPDES permitting requirements (i.e. reasonable potential analysis, assimilative capacity and dilution credits, antidegradation), non-point source program targeting and effectiveness and other program use.

Outcomes: Better understanding of how the WQS are applied for assessment purposes.

Output: Methodology that answers the question: Are the WQS being met? The applications may be specific, but the method to calculate whether WQS are being met is the same.

1) Hawaii WQS Backgound (Randee; 10 minutes)
   a) Which waterbody types are included in the WQS (HAR 11-54)?
      i) Types of marine waters
      ii) Future consideration of watershed link to inland waters

2) How do we define decision unit? (Randee; 10 minutes)
   a) By water body type current/ proposed DUs
   b) Applicable standards
      i) Recreational, Biogeochemical parameters, Toxics
   c) Brief description of current and proposed decision units

3) Identify assessment needs and factors to consider: (Randee; 5 minutes)
      i) What is representative of the condition (attainment or nonattainment)
      ii) Vary by pollutant, current, depth?
      iii) Where there are multiple monitoring stations within the decision unit, should those be considered separately, or averaged together? Would the unit be different for NPDES purposes?
      iv) What timeframe of data collection should be considered? Should this be seasonal? Does it vary by pollutant?
      v) What sources of data can be considered?
      vi) How should the data be compared to the WQS?
         (1) Where the WQS indicates a geomean or other statistically-based period (10% of the time, 2% of the time), should we calculate the data and compare directly?
         (2) For those WQS without these statistically-based periods, how should the comparison be performed? Would there be an exceedance allowance? If so, would that meet NPDES requirements?

4) Practical Application Case Studies:
   a) Current assessment methods for calculating water body status (IR): Apply method to assess 3rd party data (for enterococcus?) for Hanalei and compare results to current 303(d) listing (Allison; 15 minutes)

b) How would we do this differently applying the proposed method for IR assessments? Are there factors to consider that might be a problem? (Break into groups to discuss; 30 minutes)
c) NPDES permitting assessment applications: Define reasonable potential analysis, assimilative capacity and dilution credits, antidegradation (Elizabeth; 15 minutes)
d) NPDES permitting assessments: Current assessment methods for calculating RP and assimilative capacity (Shane; 15 minutes)
e) Apply proposed method to evaluate nutrient assimilative capacity for a recently issued NPDES permit: Honouliuli (Break into groups to discuss; 30 minutes).

5) Closing remarks and open up for discussion (Randee; 5 minutes).